



"RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR 1.116-  
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE EXAMINING  
GROUP \_\_\_\_\_"

DOCKET NO: 241197US0

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE**

IN RE APPLICATION OF :  
IKUO MATSUKURA, ET AL. : EXAMINER: ZACHARIA  
SERIAL NO: 10/634,877 :  
FILED: AUGUST 6, 2003 : GROUP ART UNIT: 1773  
FOR: PELLICLE :

**AMENDMENT AND REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313-1450

SIR:

In response to the Office Action dated November 16, 2004, please reconsider the application in view of the following remarks.

**AMENDMENT**

The **Interview Summary** begins on page 2 of this paper.

The **Remarks** begin on page 4 of this paper.

Application No.: 10/634,877

Reply to the Office Action dated: November 16, 2004

### **INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Zacharia for the helpful and courteous discussion with Applicants' Representative on January 6, 2005. The Examiner wanted a detailed explanation of why the polymer obtained in the experiment described in the Rule 132 Declaration filed October 21, 2004 is the same as polymer A of Matsukura et al. Applicants' Representative noted that monomer amount and conversion rate do not influence the ratio of monomer unit and the molecular weight of the polymer, respectively.